



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

There may be those who favor annexation, who will excuse themselves in the thought that the government was only a monarchy, and that its overthrow, however accomplished, was a praiseworthy act.

Governments ought not to disregard their moral obligations.

This transaction is tainted with injustice. Injustice it may be to the deposed Queen, but assuredly it is tainted with injustice to the 40,000 Hawaiians who should be permitted to speak in regard to the government of their native land. And we who have maintained the doctrine of Home Rule, who have pleaded for Ireland, who have raised millions of men from slavery to citizenship, can we either defend this proceeding or accept the fruit thereof?

Finally, what disposition is to be made of the present population? Of the native Hawaiians there are about 40,000, of Japanese 24,000, of Chinese 21,000, of Portuguese 15,000, of Americans 3,000, of British, Germans and French combined there are 4,000, of other nationalities a thousand. Thus the Islands contain a population of 109,000. Are the Japanese and Chinese to be deported, the plantations to be abandoned and their owners to be consigned to ruin?

The pending treaty prohibits the further immigration of Chinese, and those who are now resident in the Islands are excluded from the mainland of the United States. By annexation the country will have in view the alternative of a vassal population within its jurisdiction, or the presence of a Mongolian State in the Union.

A Dangerous Movement.

It is strange how quickly the lessons of history are forgotten. A year ago or scarcely more, the hearts of the generous and humane throughout our country were burning with shame and indignation, as they were made to realize how the Christians under Turkish rule had suffered for our jealous and selfish foreign policy in times past. As has already been pointed out, that policy was the direct effect of the international distrust and jealousy which is inseparable from militarism, and which must continue while our great armaments last.

We interfered in 1876 between Russia and Turkey in the matter of the Armenian provinces, because we were jealous of the Russian power, and feared its further extension. Twenty years later we discovered that we ourselves were the objects of jealousy and suspicion, and that our self-constituted protectorship of the Armenians was a futile thing, which we dared not exercise in the hour of their direst need. Nay, our government did not even venture to send them pecuniary help; and had not the people of England, with some in other lands also, come forward with private help to a very large extent, the survivors of the massacres would actually have been left to starve.

These awful facts were used at the time, — we do not say without justice — as a political weapon. But this has probably tended to divert attention from the deeper lesson indicated above, the shameful and unchristian character of the militarism which feeds on suspicion and which destroys the possibility of concerted action for any great and noble ends.

Certainly there is no present indication that this lesson has been taken to heart. So far from the feverish eagerness to increase our armaments having suffered any recent

check, it has in England received a new impetus during the past few months; and we are now moving on with alarming speed. Last year, a large additional sum was voted for the navy; now the cry goes forth that the army must be strengthened. Such a demand was made by Lord Wolseley in the paradoxical speech at Glasgow, in which he described England as the most peace-loving nation in the world, but nearly always at war somewhere, in the interests of peace. Next came the speech of the under secretary for war, taking up the speech of Lord Wolseley, and dilating on the "stupendous increase of territory" which the army is called to defend. A few days later a still more alarming utterance was made public, that of the Solicitor-General. It has been known for some time that the conscription is in favor with certain military authorities; but when an official person in high position lets fall such expressions as that "it might be necessary to resort to the ballot, so that a certain proportion of citizens might be *required* to serve in the militia," we feel ourselves in face of a danger which it is scarcely possible to exaggerate.

As if this were not enough, speech has followed speech within the last few days, either advocating an increase in the army — which, as Mr. Broderick announces, is to be proposed by the government — or defending the aggressive policy which occasions the call for such increase. This obvious connection must be carefully borne in mind, or we shall hardly realize the evil of identifying patriotism with the support of our petty wars of annexation, as has been done by Mr. Chamberlain at Glasgow, while at the same time, in the ears of our young people of both sexes, he poured ridicule on those who teach a world-wide human brotherhood.

It does not seem to be fully realized what rapid strides have been made in the increase of armaments during the latter part of the present reign. Since 1845, the outlay on the army and navy has been trebled, while the population has increased by less than fifty per cent. Thus the taxation of Great Britain for military purposes has, roughly speaking, *doubled* in proportion to the number of inhabitants, in little over forty years. And we know perfectly well that every addition to our own naval or military strength is a challenge to other nations to add to theirs; and that there is therefore no limit to such increase under the present vicious system, but that of the power of endurance of overtaxed populations. The comments of moderate French writers on Trafalgar celebrations may serve to remind us of a fact with which we are but too familiar. We may note also the struggles of China and Japan to take their place in the community of nations by becoming naval or military powers.

The perpetual increase of armies, out of proportion to the growth of population, naturally occasions two alternative evils, the gravity of which can scarcely be exaggerated, — either the militarizing of whole nations, as on the continent, or, as with ourselves, the entrapping of the young and thoughtless into a career which under the conditions of a standing army means moral ruin to a large proportion of them. The very large number of boys under twenty serving in our own ranks, in India as well as elsewhere, is a fact equally sorrowful and disgraceful. Many, indeed, are even under seventeen. To what all this leads we know only too well.

Yet we can not regard the Continental system with any more complacency, when we consider the rapidity with

which free nations have been transformed into subjects of a despotism, through an all-devouring militarism which at first presented itself under the attractive aspect of patriotism. We feel it to be a healthy sign that the people of England should regard compulsory military service with the utmost repugnance, as fatal to liberty. But let us observe that this position may be undermined. It is scarcely recognized to how large an extent young people, including even mere babies in their infant classes, are receiving military training; and it is even less recognized how surely such a training will foster a warlike spirit. It is no imaginary danger that the coming generation as a whole may be familiarized with the thought of taking human life and led to acquire a taste for military service. We can scarcely believe that the probability is overlooked by military men in high positions who patronize Boys' Brigades and other similar organizations. Assuredly the peril is too serious for lovers of peace and of liberty to overlook; least of all should it pass unnoticed by the followers of the Prince of Peace, those whom he has made free, and who are called to stand fast in his liberty, and not to be "entangled again" with any "yoke of bondage."

And is there not a special duty laid on the ministers of the gospel, those who have to proclaim the absolute supremacy of Christ in the world for which he died, and to call men to place themselves under his "sweet yoke where lasting freedoms be," — the duty of making their voices heard, clearly and unmistakably, in opposition to a popular cry which would lure men away from him? Week by week it is their high privilege to dwell on the self-surrender of Christ, on his laying down of his glory, "taking part" with us in that "flesh and blood" which involves so many sufferings and temptations, becoming subject even to death, — but in this position of weakness and danger living in absolute trust, refusing all defense which meant loss and pain to others, meeting injuries and insults not only with dignified meekness but with a patient and forgiving love which nothing could outweary, and finally enduring the cross, and even by that deepest darkness and humiliation winning a victory and a glory which no words can name, and a sovereignty which will one day be acknowledged throughout all the worlds. These things it is given them to teach, and then, turning to their brethren, to tell them as his messengers of their high calling to walk in his steps. Does this calling mean — can it ever mean — the cowardice of armaments and the brutality of slaughter? Rather, must it not mean an absolute protest against these things, at any needed cost? Surely the submitting to be called by cheap nicknames, the loss of reputation or position, or the sacrifice of some of the strong but misleading impulses of nature, would not be too high a price to pay for the privilege of faithfulness to Him whose true manliness was no less conspicuous than his patience.

At this very moment, there are followers of their Lord who are suffering worse things than obloquy for their faithfulness to him in this very matter. Here in England we can as yet speak out clearly and fully, without encountering any personal risk. Will not the churches use this opportunity while it lasts, and stem the advancing tide of militarism before it grows resistless in its strength?

We would not appear to overlook what has already been done in this direction. Far from this, we recognize with thankfulness the important service that has been rendered

to the cause of arbitration by the warm advocacy of the churches here as in America, and by all they have done to promote a brotherly feeling between the English-speaking races. But there is still the utmost need for a strong and unanimous movement forwards. There are solemn warnings before our eyes, not only in the fatal progress of militarism on the Continent, but in the degeneration of our own national morality. We look to the ministers of Christ to arrest this downward march; believing that they may yet save their country, if they will rise in the strength of his word within them, away from the splendors of an empire growing through bloodshed and broken faith, to the true glory of the Son of God. *Now* is the time; now, while we are preparing to celebrate his coming on this earth in weakness, yet in that weakness bearing with him the all-conquering might by which he triumphed over death. May God grant to his servants clear sight, and words of power; for truly in this matter we know not what a day may bring forth; and should a downward course be persisted in, the issue may be one of which we little dream.

— W. C. BRAITHWAITE, ESQ., in *War or Brotherhood*.

Justice Field and the Supreme Court.

There can be little doubt that the Supreme Court of the United States is one of the greatest, if not the greatest and noblest, of all our institutions. It is a great peace institution, the model, in some important respects, of the great international tribunal which is some day certain to be set up for all the nations of the world. We are sure our readers will all be delighted and profited by reading the letter which Justice Stephen J. Field recently sent to the other members of the Court when he retired from it after thirty-four years of service. It is needless to say, what the whole nation knows, that Justice Field has been one of the most diligent, able and conscientious jurists ever connected with the Supreme Court. Here is the text of the letter:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, D.C., Oct. 12, 1897.

Dear Mr. Chief Justice and Brethren: Near the close of last term, feeling that the duties of my office had become too arduous for my strength, I transmitted my resignation to the President, to take effect on the first day of December next, and this he has accepted, with kindly expressions of regard, as will be seen from a copy of his letter, which is as follows:

"EXECUTIVE MANSION, WASHINGTON, D.C., Oct. 9, 1897.
Hon. Stephen J. Field, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C.—

My Dear Sir: In April last Chief Justice Fuller, accompanied by Mr. Justice Brewer handed me your resignation as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to take effect Dec. 1, 1897. In hereby accepting your resignation, I wish to express my deep regret that you feel compelled by advancing years to sever your active connection with the court of which you have so long been a distinguished member.

"Entering upon your great office in May, 1863, you will, on the 1st of next December, have served upon this bench for a period of thirty-four years and seven months, a term longer than that of any member of the court since